

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ROMEO COOLEY
Petitioner

vs.

MS. M. BROOKS, et al,
Respondents.

)
)
)
)
)
)

C.A.No. 10-185 Erie

Magistrate Judge Baxter

MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

I RECOMMENDATION

It is respectfully recommended that the instant petition for writ of habeas corpus be dismissed due to Petitioner's failure to prosecute.

II REPORT

Petitioner, an inmate currently incarcerated within the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus on August 2, 2010. Petitioner was ordered to either pay the filing fee or file a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis before August 20, 2010. ECF No. 2. The Order explained that failure to comply could result in the dismissal of this petition due to failure to prosecute. As of today's date, Petitioner has failed to comply with this order.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has set out a six-factor balancing test to guide a court in determining whether dismissal of a case is appropriate. Poulis v. State Farm Fire and Casualty Company, 747 F.2d 863 (3d Cir. 1984). The court must consider: 1) the extent of the party's personal responsibility; 2) the prejudice to the adversary caused by the failure to meet scheduling orders and respond to discovery; 3) a history of dilatoriness; 4) whether the conduct of the party or attorney was willful or in bad faith; 5) the effectiveness of sanctions other than dismissal, which entails an analysis of alternative

sanctions; and 6) the meritoriousness of the claim or defense. Id. at 868. Not all of the six factors need to weigh in favor of dismissal before dismissal is warranted. Hicks v. Feeney, 850 F.2d 152 (3d Cir. 1988).

Applying the Poulis factors to the present matter, this Court recommends the dismissal of this matter. Since the filing of this matter, Petitioner has taken the necessary first steps to prosecute this case. Further, Petitioner has ignored an order of this Court. Petitioner is proceeding *pro se* and therefore bears all of the responsibility for any failure in the prosecution of his claims. Alternative sanctions, such as monetary penalties, are inappropriate with indigent parties in a habeas case. Although it is possible that Petitioner's allegations could state a habeas claim upon which relief could be ultimately be granted, the merits of the claim are impossible to determine at this early stage of the proceedings.

III CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully recommended that this case be dismissed due to Petitioner's failure to prosecute.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed.R.Civ.P. 72, the parties are allowed fourteen (14) days from the date of service to file written objections to this Report and Recommendation. Any party opposing the objections shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of service of objections to respond thereto. See Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b)(2). Failure to file timely objections may constitute a waiver of appellate rights. See Nara v. Frank, 488 F.3d 187 (3d Cir. 2007).

S/ Susan Paradise Baxter
SUSAN PARADISE BAXTER
United States Magistrate Judge

Dated: August 30, 2010